Title II of the Higher Education Act
Institutional Report

Report Year 1
Academic year: 1999-2000
Fall 1999, Winter, 2000, Summer 2000

Institution name: **University of Missouri-Columbia**
Respondent name and title: Michael Pullis, Associate Dean
Respondent phone number: (573) 882-7831 Fax: (573) 884-4024
Electronic mail address: pullism@missouri.edu
Address: 101 Hill Hall
City: Columbia State: MO Zip code: 65211

Section I. Pass rates.

Please provide the information in Tables C1 and C2 on the performance of completers of the teacher preparation program in your institution on teacher certification/licensure assessments used by your state.

Program completers for whom information should be provided are those completing program requirements in the most recent academic year. Thus, for institutional reports due to the state by April 7, 2001, the relevant information is for those completing program requirements in academic year 1999-2000. For purposes of this report, program completers do not include those who have completed an alternative route to certification or licensure as defined by the state.

The assessments to be included are the ones taken by these completers up to 5 years before their completion of program requirements, or up to 3 years afterward. (Please note that in 3 years institutions will report final pass rates that include an update on this cohort of completers; the update will reflect scores reported after the test closure date.) See guide pages 10 and 11.

In cases where a program completer has taken a given assessment more than once, the highest score on that test must be used. There must be at least 10 program completers taking the same assessment in an academic year for data on that assessment to be reported; for aggregate or summary data, there must also be at least 10 program completers (although not necessarily taking the same assessment) for data to be reported.

Note: The procedures for developing the information required for these tables are explained in the National Center for Education Statistics document entitled *Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation: Title II, Higher Education Act*. Terms and phrases in this questionnaire are defined in the glossary, appendix B of the guide.

Table C1: Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Institution Name	University of Missouri Columbia
Institution Code	6875
State	Missouri
Number of Program Completers Submitted	267
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations[1]	255

					Statewide		
Type of Assessment	*Assessment Code Number*	*Number Taking Assessment*	*Number Passing Assessment*	*Institutional Pass Rate*	*Number Taking Assessment*	*Number Passing Assessment*	*Statewide Pass Rate*
Professional Knowledge							

Principles Learning & Teaching 5-9	523	25	25	100%	135	133	99%
Academic Content Areas							
Elem Ed Curr Instruc Assessment	011	73	73	100%	1614	1547	96%
Early Childhood Education	020	22	22	100%	256	256	100%
English Language and Literature	040	2			14	14	100%
Eng Lang Lit Comp Content Knowledge	041	22	21	95%	172	168	98%
Mathematics	060	1			4		
Mathematics: Content Knowledge	061	12	12	100%	126	123	98%
Social Studies: Content Knowledge	081	24	23	96%	276	269	97%
Physical Education	090	1			13	13	100%
Business Education	100	7			77	77	100%
Music Content Knowledge	113	7			129	122	95%
Art Content Knowledge	133	5			75	75	100%
French	170	1			10	10	100%
German Content Knowledge	181	3			5		
Spanish Content Knowledge	191	11	11	100%	52	45	87%
Biology Content Knowledge Part 1	231	13	13	100%	92	90	98%
Chemistry Content Knowledge	241	1			11	10	91%
Physics Content Knowledge	261	1			2		
Other Content Areas							
Technology Education	050	1			11	10	91%
Home Economics Education	120	3			18	18	100%
Speech Communication	220	2			35	35	100%
Agriculture	700	9			34	34	100%
Teaching Special Populations							
Speech-Language Pathology	330	4			112	111	99%
Special Education	350	6			207	207	100%

Table C2: Aggregate And Summary Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Institution Name	University of Missouri Columbia
Institution Code	6875
State	Missouri
Number of Program Completers Submitted	267
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations[1]	255

				Statewide		
Type of Assessment[2]	***Number Taking Assessment***[3]	***Number Passing Assessment***[4]	***Institutional Pass Rate***	***Number Taking Assessment***[3]	***Number Passing Assessment***[4]	***Statewide Pass Rate***
Aggregate - Basic Skills						
Aggregate - Professional Knowledge	25	25	100%	144	142	99%
Aggregate - Academic Content Areas (Elementary Education, Math, English, Biology, etc.)	206	204	99%	3148	3026	96%
Aggregate - Other Content Areas (Career/Technical Education, Health	15	15	100%	101	100	99%

Educations, etc.)						
Aggregate - Teaching Special Populations (Special Education, ELS, etc.)	10	10	100%	319	318	100%
Aggregate - Performance Assessments						
Summary Totals and Pass Rates[5]	255	253	99%	3678	3553	97%

[1] The number of program completers found, matched and used in the passing rate calculation will not equal the sum of the column labeled "Number Taking Assessment" since a completer can take more than one assessment.
[2] Institutions and/or States did not require the assessments within an aggregate where data cells are blank.
[3] Number of completers who took one or more tests in a category and within their area of specialization.
[4] Number who passed all tests they took in a category and within their area of specialization.
[5] Summary Totals and Pass Rate: Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the state for licensure and the total pass rate.

Section II. Program information.

A Number of students in the regular teacher preparation program at your institution:

Please specify the number of students in your teacher preparation program during academic year 1999-2000, including all areas of specialization.

1. Total number of students enrolled during 1999-2000: **1121**

B Information about supervised student teaching:

2. How many students (in the regular program and any alternative route programs) were in programs of supervised student teaching during academic year 1999-2000? **267**

3. Please provide the numbers of supervising faculty who were:

2 Appointed full-time faculty in professional education: an individual who works full time in a school, college, or department of education, and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students.

2 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution: any full time faculty member in the institution who also may be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program.

42 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution: may be part time university faculty or pre-K-12 teachers who supervise prospective teachers. The numbers do not include K-12 teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend among institutions of higher education to appoint K-12 teachers as clinical faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of the institution's regular faculty.

Supervising faculty for purposes of this data collection includes all persons who the institution regards as having faculty status and who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, with an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program.
Total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation program during 1999-2000: **46**

4. The student/faculty ratio was (divide the total given in B2. by the number given in B3.): **5.8:1**

5. The average number of hours per week required of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: **40** hours. The total number of weeks of supervised student teaching required is **16**. The total number of hours required is **640** hours.

C Information about state approval or accreditation of teacher preparation programs:

6. Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited by the state?
   X Yes _____ No
7. Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as "low-performing" by the state (as per section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)? _____ Yes **X** No

   NOTE: See appendix A of the guide for the legislative language referring to "low-performing" programs.

Section III. Contextual information (optional).

A. Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s).

To further support our unit's goals of developing and training reflective practitioners, we have engaged in two specific courses of action designed to facilitate this process. The first is a comprehensive and developmental approach to portfolio design and assessment. The second is the implementation of a pilot program that offers elementary education majors a full year in the field during their Senior Year.

The Portfolio Process

Rigorous reflection as defined in the design framework requires the candidate to question, examine and inquire into assumptions, values and long-held principles and beliefs. The candidate is encouraged to carefully examine new knowledge, to understand the nature of that knowledge and then further reflect on how that knowledge will impact classroom practice and learning. The portfolio process allows the student opportunity to refine the ability to communicate their thoughts and to demonstrate this reflective capability.

Our portfolio process is developmental, beginning in Phase I of our program. To progress into Phase II of our program (Junior professional standing), students must complete a portfolio, presented in written format, and then engage in an oral presentation about the portfolio. The written version must address the 10 Mo-STEP standards (state criteria for teacher preparation) at a designated mid-preparation level of competence. The oral presentation is given to a panel consisting of faculty, instructors, administrators and staff from both the University and the Public Schools. In this presentation, candidates must articulate their current philosophy of teaching and learning, discuss one of the standards and their competency in relationship to that standard, and finish with their own personal plan for continued professional development.

At the end of Phase II, and prior to the student teaching internship (Phase III) of the program, candidates construct an interview portfolio in both paper and electronic formats. Designed to assist candidates in required interviews with public school administration, this portfolio allows the opportunity to further refine the teaching and learning philosophy and allow the candidate to synthesize their folio of materials for professional discourse.

During Phase III of the program, candidates submit their in-depth portfolio designed to demonstrate competency in both the State Standards for teacher candidates and standards developed by national programs in specific content areas. This portfolio, reviewed by faculty teams, is then utilized as part of the criteria to determine eligibility for certification.

The Senior Year On-Site Pilot Program

Uncertain situations of practice, and the reflection-in-action associated with complex problem situations, is best explored within the context of the setting in which these situations occur. The student, immersed in educational phenomena, on a daily basis, has many more opportunities to engage in reflective practice. To assist in promoting these opportunities, an increase in the number of field hours is a cornerstone of our newly revised teacher preparation program. In addition to increasing the number of hours throughout the program, faculty approved an option to deliver an on-site Senior year program designed to give candidates an even greater in-depth experience in their Senior Year. In addition to the 16-week internship offered in the second semester, students are eligible to participate in a first semester, intensive on-site field experience that begins with the start of the school year.

This project, currently in the second year of the three-year pilot program, has already demonstrated tremendous potential for strengthening the training of these pre-service teachers. Initiated with one district and one candidate in the 1999-2000 academic year, the pilot was expanded to three districts and four school sites,

involving 14 candidates, in the 2000-2001 academic year. As we enter the third year of the pilot, four districts have been identified for participating, and the number of eligible candidates has increased to 21. This program, currently under extensive evaluation, shows promise in promoting increased skill, knowledge and reflective practice in those candidates that participate. Candidates actually become a part of the instructional team at their designated school. They attend meetings prior to the start of the school year, assist teachers and staff in preparing buildings and rooms, and are present on the first day of the school year. Four courses are offered on-site, with a combination of university faculty, mentor teachers from the districts, and adjunct faculty serving as instructional leaders. In addition to the coursework, extensive field opportunities are offered, allowing candidates the opportunity to view all grade levels, observe many different classroom teachers, and prepare units that they can actually teach, revise and re-deliver in another classroom.

The current qualitative data indicates that candidates express increased confidence in their ability to initiate the start of the school year, increased confidence in their knowledge of grade levels and developmental differences among school-age children, and increased confidence in their knowledge and skill in the implementation of instruction.

B. Missouri has asked each institution to include at least the following information.

1. Institution Mission

Mission Statement
University of Missouri
Columbia

The University of Missouri-Columbia, MU, is the largest and oldest campus of the state's major public research institutions. MU's primary mission in research and doctoral education provides enhanced opportunities and challenges in the undergraduate areas of humanities, arts, and sciences and in selected professional fields and provides the basis for service to the people of the state via outreach programs.

A predominantly residential campus, MU serves select and diverse undergraduate and professional students from all parts of the state. Its graduate students are recruited nationally and internationally. Through its outreach programs, MU meets selected educational and informational needs of Missouri citizens throughout the state.

MU aspires to achieve national and international prominence for its research and educational contributions. It will build on its research strengths in basic and applied biological and biomedical sciences; nuclear and related physical and engineering sciences; and selected social and behavioral sciences. It will strengthen its leadership roles in agriculture and journalism. Because of its large enrollment of undergraduates, MU will enhance the core disciplines required for all those seeking baccalaureate degrees, giving special attention to areas, such as languages and mathematical sciences, that provide the necessary foundation for truly educated citizens.

2. Educational Philosophy

Vision of the University of Missouri-Columbia College of Education

The vision of the College of Education is to change Missouri and the nation one infant, one child and one adult at a time through excellence in instruction, scholarship and service.

Mission of the University of Missouri-Columbia College of Education

To achieve this vision the College is dedicated to increasing research-based, professional practice that enables people to achieve their highest potential. For most, this will include higher levels of abstract, conceptual learning that can be applied to real world problems. For some, it may include basic and functional skills necessary for independent participation in society.

3. Conceptual Frameworks

Over-Arching Design Framework for All Professional Certification Programs

Educators Who Are Reflective and Inquiring Professionals

Professional practice involves judgment and wise action in complex, unique, and often times uncertain situations. These situations are also frequently characterized by conflict in values and ethical stances about the nature of the problems to be addressed and the appropriate means of solving them (Schon, 1991; Harris, 1993). In this view of professional practice, three types of professional knowledge and competence are highlighted: the specialized bodies of knowledge pertinent to the profession, practical knowledge and competencies, and reflective competencies (Harris, 1993). These are the knowledge bases of the reflective practitioner.

The model of the reflective practitioner focuses attention on the need for professionals to rigorously reflect upon situations, actions, and assumptions, employing technical and practical knowledge, as well as ethical criteria. A central concept in models of the reflective practitioner is the notion of reflection. In reflective practice, little is taken for granted, left unquestioned, or unexamined. The focus of reflection may include common practices, assumptions, and recommended principles that are utilized in the schools and taught at universities.

There are several definitions of reflection found in the literature, most of which relate to Dewey's inquiry-oriented teacher education concepts. Most definitions typically include three dimensions: a) an inquiry orientation, b) an inquiry process, and c) the nature of educational phenomena. These dimensions, as they relate the definition of reflection, are discussed below.

The first dimension, an inquiry orientation, suggests that a reflective teacher with holds judgments concerning a particular teaching event to consider available alternatives to established teaching practice. For example, reflective teachers question aspects of teaching that are generally taken for granted, including their own beliefs and assumptions about teaching.

The second dimension, an inquiry process, suggests that a reflective teacher uses problem-posing and problem-solving processes when considering alternatives to established teaching practice. When applying this process, the reflective teacher inquires into the exact nature of problematic situation, identifies alternatives to taken-for-granted practices, tests the alternatives in classroom situations, and monitors the results of each test. Thus, reflective teaching involves both insight and action that is focused both inwardly at their own teaching practice (and the practices of colleagues) and outwardly at the social conditions in which these practices exist.

The specific nature of the inquiry process depends, to a great extent, upon the perspective taken on the third dimension, the nature of the educational phenomena. Educational phenomena can be viewed from a limited perspective (e.g., focusing on curricular topics and instructional techniques) or from a broader perspective which also includes the social nature of education and the role of education in meeting the needs and purposes of humanity. The reflective teacher is viewed as one who not only addresses what should be included in curriculum and teaching, but thus incorporates moral ethical criteria in reflecting on technical and practical domains of knowledge and action (Van Manen, 1977).

Dewey (1993) made an important conceptual distinction in teachers' behaviors when he contrasted routine and reflective teaching practices. Routine practice is behavior guided by impulse, tradition, habit, and authority. Routine practice is characterized by uncritical acceptance and unquestioning implementation of common school practices. For example, a routine planning practice might include following a teacher's manual without considering varying student interests backgrounds or needs, alternative activities, or time constraints on teaching and learning.

Reflective practice therefore requires knowledge bases for reflection, subjects of reflection, and attitudes of reflection. The process is also recursive, in that the reflection process itself and the knowledge bases are also subjects of reflection, monitoring, and analysis. The rigorous use of these processes and bases of knowledge contribute to wise action and judgment within the uncertain situations of practice.

4. Program completers who teach in the private schools and out of state

Private Schools: 6
Out-of-State Schools: 18